

# Review Protocol

## On-Site Review Process

The on-site review is a process developed within the framework of the Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance Program's (CCGP) structure to ensure that the school counseling team has implemented the program elements described in the review standards. Historically, we have referred to this on-site review process as an "evaluation" which provides program "accountability." It may be helpful to provide some definitions and common language to use in the on-site review process:

*Accountability:* We can discuss accountability in terms of meeting program standards or using funds appropriately. However, in the late 20<sup>th</sup> and early 21<sup>st</sup> centuries, accountability as used by the general public means student achievement.

*Evaluation:* "The purpose of evaluation is. . . to improve. . . In educational evaluation, all available types of data, qualitative as well as quantitative, may be brought to bear" (*Evaluating Guidance Programs: A Practitioner's Guide*, 1991, ACT, p. 11). Historically, aside from the needs data, the CCGP has not emphasized the use of data to define program goals or measure program success in meeting these goals. Effective school improvement, as well as the Northwest Accreditation process, require an increase in the use of data related to all educational programs, including CCGP.

*On-site review:* A peer-to-peer review of the standards/elements of a Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance Program.

*Program audit:* "The program audit is used to assess the school counseling program in comparison with [a set of standards or a model program]. Audits serve to set the standard for the school counseling program. Audits are first performed when a counseling program is being designed and then yearly to appraise the progress of the program development. Using the findings of both program implementation and results, strength and weaknesses are determined, and goals are created for the following year" (*ASCA National Model for School Counseling Programs, Second Edition*, American School Counseling Association, 2005, p. 131).

The on-site review process, as we have known it, provides an audit of the Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance Program – it has been used to ensure that a program is in place. Although the ASCA Model for School Counseling Programs uses the term "program audit," in Utah we will use "annual self-evaluation and Performance Review" in lieu of the term "audit." An evaluation of the Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance Program requires looking at the results, specifically improved performance for students. This document can help members of a guidance team begin making connections between Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance Program elements or standards and desired results for students as required by the Northwest Accreditation process described in the National Study of School Improvement (NSSE) document *School Improvement: Focusing on Student Performance*. A Level 3 rating on a standard means that the program has met the expectation for that standard. A Level 4 rating indicates an exemplary program that has connected school improvement plans and processes.

The on-site review process works like an SEP/SEOP conference for the Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance Program in that it serves to:

- Celebrate the school Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance Program.
- Recognize program strengths and accomplishments.
- Identify goals and areas for improvement.

## Elementary Expectations

It is the goal of the Utah State Office of Education to have 100 percent of students in grades K-12 receive support from a CCGP. While they move toward achieving that goal, counselors or guidance personnel of elementary students should complete this document as a self-assessment. Personnel in the elementary schools will not be expected to defend their self-assessment in a formal review. However, using this document as a self-evaluation will aid elementary CCGP counselors or guidance specialists in better meeting the requirements of the Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance model. Elementary counselors and programs are encouraged to meet these same competencies and provide these same services.

## Essential Elements for the On-Site Review Process

In order to be prepared for a successful performance evaluation, a school program must have prepared three items:

1. A completed self-evaluation of the CCGP with copies of the self-evaluation for every member of the review team.
2. A program manual – see the description that follows.
3. Documentation, in the form of an evidence box or file, that the program as described in the manual exists and is being implemented.

## Program Manual

In years past, most schools have provided a large binder that included program descriptions and substantial evidence supporting the program. Now, following the format of this document, the program being reviewed provides a program manual that contains a brief written response to each of the twelve standards, with a declaration of the level of self-evaluation for each indicator followed by specific details that support that self-evaluation. Programs must then also provide an organized file of evidence that may or may not be reviewed to support the written description and self-evaluation ratings.

## General Format for the On-Site Review Process

1. At least one month prior to the on-site review, the Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance team completes a copy of the Performance Self-Evaluation and submits the completed form to the district counseling leader. Completing a self-evaluation allows for honest reflection on the Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance Program and provides genuine opportunities for program improvement. The guidance team under review should circle the box for each indicator as the team believes it applies to the program.
2. The following time frame is recommended for the actual on-site review:
  - a. One to 1½ hours for the counseling and guidance team to make its presentation. **The actual presentation should focus on the standards listed in Section II: Direct Services, which includes Responsive Services, School Guidance Curriculum, Career Exploration and Development, SEOP Process and Every Student, and Standard VII, Data and Program Effectiveness.** School counselors must show that each activity implemented as part of the school counseling program was developed from careful analysis of student needs, achievement and related data. Information to support Standards I through VI should be covered incidentally within the context of the Direct Services presentation. Plan your time for each standard accordingly. Please make student, parent, and teacher involvement brief. The review team leader should keep team questions brief and the discussion focused.
  - b. One-half to one hour for members of the review team to discuss their findings and prepare a summary and feedback for the program being evaluated.

- c. One-half to one hour to discuss the evaluation with the Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance Program team members, allowing adequate time for response and feedback from the team members of the program being reviewed.

### **On-Site Review Guidelines**

1. Generally, one Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance Program will be reviewed by one team in one day. Exceptions to this guideline may be obtained by submitting a written request to the state Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance specialist.
2. The Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance team during the review presents evidence to support the levels of performance on the self-evaluation for each standard. The review team can then check the indicator boxes as the team makes the presentation. This should result in a side-by-side comparison of the self-evaluation and the review team evaluation.
3. District leaders overseeing the on-site review will acquire signatures from team members and district leadership. In charter school program reviews, the charter school CCGP team will acquire appropriate counselor leadership signatures.
4. District/charter school counseling leaders submit a finalized copy of the review to the USOE CCGP Specialist by **May 1** of the current school year.

### **On-Site Review Team**

1. A site review team leader is identified to facilitate the review process. This team leader should have participated on three or four review teams and should have prepared for a school's on-site review more than once.
2. Generally, team members include a district CTE director and/or a district counseling director, two or three school counselors, and a building administrator.
3. The majority of review team members should be from schools at the same level as the program being reviewed; e.g., middle school/JHS counselors review middle school/JHS programs, and high school counselors review high school programs. Likewise, alternative/charter school programs should be reviewed by at least one other alternative/charter school counselor.
4. In the case of charter schools the Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance Program is evaluated by a team from the resident district, and meets the standards as described for program approval.
5. Elementary counselors or administrators should participate as evaluators only if they have recent experience at the secondary level and have a good understanding of secondary Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance Programs. However, elementary personnel and others can be observers.
6. Team members should recognize that the on-site review is a formal process requiring professional etiquette; cell phones should be off and schedules arranged to give full attention to the guidance team presentation and the review process.

## Related Policies and Guidelines

### **53A-1a-106. School district and individual school powers.**

(2) (b) (i) Each local school board, in consultation with school personnel, parents, and school community councils or similar entities shall establish policies to provide for the effective implementation of a personalized student education plan (SEP) or student education/occupation plan (SEOP) for each student at the school site.

(ii) The policies shall include guidelines and expectations for:

(A) recognizing the student's accomplishments, strengths, and progress towards meeting student achievement standards as defined in U-PASS;

(B) planning, monitoring, and managing education and career development; and

(C) involving students, parents, and school personnel in preparing and implementing SEPs and SEOPs.

(iii) A parent may request conferences with school personnel in addition to SEP or SEOP conferences established by local school board policy.

(iv) Time spent during the school day to implement SEPs and SEOPs is considered part of the school term referred to in Subsection **53A-17a-103(5)**.

### **R277-462-3. Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance Program Approval and Qualifying Criteria.**

A. (1) In order to qualify for Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance Program funds, schools shall implement SEOP policies and practices, consistent with Section 53A-1a-106(2)(b), local board or charter school governing board policy, and the school improvement plan developed for Northwest Accreditation.

*The Utah Model for Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance Programs provides the following targets.*

#### **Sample Distribution of Total School Counselor Time**

Delivery System Component	Elementary School % of Time	Middle School % of Time	High School % of Time
Guidance Curriculum	35-45%	25-35%	15-25%
Individual Student Planning	5-10%	15-25%	25-35%
Responsive Services	30-40%	30-40%	25-35%
System Support	10-15%	10-15%	15-20%

Adapted from Gysbers, N.C. & Henderson, P. (Eds.) (2000). *Developing and managing your school guidance program (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.)*, Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.

In a typical 180-day school year, the actual days spent in each program delivery area might look like this.

	<b>Percentages</b>		
	Elementary School	Middle/Junior High	High School
Responsive Services	<b>35%</b> (=63 days)	<b>25%</b> (=45 days)	<b>25%</b> (=45 days)
Guidance Curriculum	<b>40%</b> (=72 days)	<b>35%</b> (=63 days)	<b>25%</b> (=45 days)
Individual Planning	<b>10%</b> (=18 days)	<b>25%</b> (=45 days)	<b>25 – 35%</b> (=45-63 days)
System Support	<b>15%</b> (=27 days)	<b>15%</b> (=27 days)	<b>15%</b> (=27 days)

## Meeting the Needs of Diverse Students

Diversity comes in many forms, from cultural and ethnic background to socioeconomic status to family structure and religious choices, including gender, language, age, and ability differences. Professional school counselors are expected to develop specific skills and knowledge to support and advocate for the diverse student populations served by the Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance Program.

Indicators have been incorporated in Standards II, VI, VII, VIII, IX, and X to focus on the five diversity groups recognized by the federal government: American Indian/Alaskan Native, African American, Asian American, Hispanic/Latino, and Pacific Islander. The purpose of **Standard XII, Every Student, then, is to show that school counselors, through the Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance Program, understand the ways in which students at any one school differ from one another** (including cultural and ethnic background, socioeconomic status, family structure, and religious choices, as well as gender, language, age and ability differences) **and that adjustments have been made** in the implementation of the Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance Program for that school to accommodate those differences.

Respond to these new indicators as they apply to your school population.

## What Makes American Indian Tribes so Different From Other Ethnic Minorities?

### TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS AS SOVERIGN NATIONS

“Indian tribes have held a unique position in the history of the American government as well as in contemporary affairs. The basis for that position is the fact that Indian tribes were recognized as sovereign from the time of discovery and recognition continues today.”

– Nancy M. Tuthill

What make American Indian tribes so unique from other ethnic minorities, besides their indigenous status, is that they are **land based** and have a **political relationship** with the United States government. This political relationship has several legal bases: (1) the “Commerce clause” of the U.S. constitution; (2) treaties between the U.S. and the Indian nations, legislation and subsequent federal policy; and (3) Supreme Court decisions and executive actions.

American Indian tribes, however, do not enjoy absolute sovereignty. Indian tribes do not exercise international independence (but neither do state governments). They are domestic independent nations (nations within a nation having a nation-to-nation relationship with the Federal Government). Additionally, the Federal Government has a unique trust or fiduciary responsibility for American Indian tribes and their interests and assets, as a result of treaties which stressed “such services as education, health, etc. in exchange for land.”

– Excerpted from the *American Indian Education Resource Book*, USOE, June 2004

Because of the unique relationship between the federal government and tribal governments as sovereign nations, and the commitment made to the American Indian/Alaskan Native people by the Utah State Office of Education in the State Education Plan, some indicators specific to American Indian/Alaskan Native students have also been added to Standards II, VI, VII, VIII, IX, and X of this document. As other ethnic/cultural communities come forward to offer suggestions for help specific to their students, additional indicators may be added.

## Important:

*Team leaders, please read the following interpretations of the Level of Performance ratings aloud to the members of the on-site review team and the Comprehensive Guidance Program team prior to beginning the program review:*

- |         |   |
|---------|---|
| Level 4 | An overall 4 rating on a standard indicates an exemplary CCG Program with data supporting contributions to school improvement, student achievement and connections to the overall mission of the school. Standards rated at this level have a close connection to the NSSE School Improvement Plan and the Northwest Accreditation process described in R227-413. |
| Level 3 | Standards rated at this level are recognized as part of a fully functioning program. Most good Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance Programs will have most standards rated at this level.   |
| Level 2 | Standards rated at this level indicate areas for improvement. An adequate explanation will have been provided clarifying why the program is functioning at this level in this standard. It will not be unusual for a school's guidance program to have some areas in need of improvement.   |
| Level 1 | Standards rated at this level are considered clearly deficient by the evaluation team and need immediate attention. Specific plans should be made for the time, effort and renewed commitment to the Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance Program required for improvement.  |
| Level 0 | Standards rated at this level indicate that guidance teams need further explanation and greater understanding regarding the requirements of the Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance Program and/or the requirements of the on-site review process.  |

## What this means:

**Level 4 overall ratings** on a standard indicate a strong integration with school improvement and the Northwest Accreditation process, and a clear connection between Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance Program processes and student results.

Mostly **Level 3 overall ratings** for the standards indicate a strong Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance Program. However, guidance team members should recognize that Level 2 ratings help to identify areas for improvement.

Three or fewer **Level 2 overall ratings** for the standards indicate that a Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance Program can pass the review process; however, the review team should fully consider these ratings in the context of the overall program.

Four or five **Level 2 overall ratings** would indicate that another review should be scheduled for the program in one year.

A **Level 0 or 1 overall rating** for any standard would require, at a minimum, a six-month follow-up review of at least that standard by the same review team.

Overall ratings include careful consideration of all indicators for each standard. One Level 0 or Level 1 on an indicator does not necessarily mean failure. Likewise, one Level 2 on an indicator would not automatically eliminate a Level 3 overall rating on a standard.

## Declaration of Eligibility for Level 4 Rating

1. The school is within one academic year (prior to, same year, or year following) of the Northwest Accreditation site visit.

Date of scheduled visit: \_\_\_\_\_

Today's date: \_\_\_\_\_

2. The school improvement team has been organized since \_\_\_\_\_ and is fully functioning.

List members of school improvement team:

_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

3. The school counselor(s) have actively participated with the school improvement team. Describe the nature of the counselor(s) involvement.
4. The school is eligible for a Level 4 rating (e.g., this is not a new school undergoing its first CCGP Performance Evaluation).